

Historical Context on Indiana's School Turnaround Efforts

Presentation to Committee on School Turnarounds

August 21, 2014

Topics

► State and Federal Context

- ► Activities Preceding SBOE Interventions
- ► Indiana's Turnaround Academies

Performance Categories (P.L. 221)

IC 20-31-8-3 and IC 20-31-8-4 (dates back to P.L. 221, 1999)

- ► The State Board of Education (SBOE) "shall establish a number of categories... to designate performance based on the individual student academic performance and growth to proficiency in each school."
- ► Further, the SBOE "shall place each school in a category or designation of school performance based on the department's findings from the assessment of performance and academic growth" as further described in statute.
- ▶ SBOE adopted rules in 2001, which included names for performance categories e.g., Academic Progress, Academic Probation, as well as a method of calculating performance.

Performance Category Updates (2011-2013)

- ► The SBOE adopted rule language in 2011 changing the performance category names to an A to F letter grade scale, although the methodology for placing schools in categories remained the same
- ► The current A-F rules determining how grades are determined were adopted in 2012 and implemented for the first time for school grades assigned for the 2011-2012 academic year
- ▶ In 2013, state law was modified to require that the performance categories be labeled using an A through F scale

State Board Interventions

- If a school is in the lowest performance category (an "F") for six years consecutively, then the SBOE shall determine an intervention for the school.
- ▶ IC 20-31-9-4 lists the following interventions: (1) Merging the school with a nearby school that is in a higher performance category; (2) Assigning a special management team to operate all or part of the school; (3) The IDOE's recommendation for improving the school; (4) Other options for school improvement, including closing the school; (5) Revising the school's plan in any of the following areas: (a) changes in school procedures or operations; (b) professional development; (c) intervention for individual teachers or administrators.
- Public hearing in the school corporation where the school is located.
- ► The SBOE must implement an intervention if it determines that the intervention will improve the school.

Statutory Definition of "Turnaround Academy"

- ► Any school in which the Board has intervened is considered a "turnaround academy" under IC 20-31-9-4.
- ► This includes schools operated by a special management company, referred to in Indiana as a "Turnaround School Operator" or "TSO", or a school in which a "Lead Partner" is conducting a more limited scope of work.



Federal Requirements: NCLB Waiver

- Indiana's received full approval in February 2012 for its waiver request from certain aspects of No Child Left Behind (NCLB 2001).
- Indiana was among cohort of 10 states to receive a waiver.
- Among other flexibilities granted, Indiana received approval to use one accountability system - the state's A-F system - instead of both the federal AYP system and the state's accountability system (P.L. 221)
- Defined Priority Schools as schools receiving an F or a D/F for two or more consecutive years
- Defined Focus Schools as schools receiving a D (firstyear)

NCLB Waiver Commitment for Turnaround Academies

▶ "For a Turnaround Academy to rejoin the LEA, the SBOE will need to see that the LEA has, in the time that the Turnaround Academy has been operated by a TSO, demonstrated significant improvement in its other priority and focus schools as well as made appropriate district-level changes in staffing and structure to better support its low-performing schools. When determining the next steps for a Turnaround Academy at the end of the TSO's four-year operational contract, the SBOE will have a menu of options from which to select, including renewing the TSO's contract."

Exit Options Added in 2014

IC 20-31-9-9 allows for the following:

- Not later than December 31 of the fifth year of an intervention under this chapter, the state board shall take one (1) of the following actions:
- ▶ (1) Return the school to the school corporation for operation.
- ▶ (2) Direct the special management team to apply to a charter school authorizer for charter school status for the school.
- ▶ (3) Implement a new intervention under section 4(b) of this chapter.



Topics

State and Federal Context

► Activities Preceding SBOE Interventions

► Indiana's Turnaround Academies

State Activities Under P.L. 221: School Quality Reviews

- ▶ P.L. 221 requires review of schools following 4 consecutive years in the lowest performance category
- ► This occurred for the first time in 2009-2010 for 23 schools
- Cambridge Education contracted with the state to assist with Year-4 School Quality Reviews
 - To advise the SBOE and IDOE concerning turnaround operations
 - 2. To create Quality Review Visitation Teams
 - To prepare Quality Review Findings reported to the School Principal and District Personnel following the review
- ▶ Prior to school visits, community meetings held to gather input, which was shared with districts and school principals

School Monitoring Activities in Year 5: 2010-2011

- ▶ 23 schools statewide were on track for possible intervention by the SBOE in Year 6 under P.L. 221
- ► IDOE Title Office staff:
 - Monitored implementation of Cambridge recommendations
 - Visited each of the 23 schools a minimum of 4 times
- Federal SIG (a) Grants were awarded to assist schools
- ▶ 16 of the 23 schools made enough improvements to avoid placement in lowest performance category
- ▶ 7 of the 23 schools remained in the lowest performance category, triggering SBOE intervention under P.L. 221
 - ▶ 1 Gary Community School Corporation school
 - 6 IPS schools

Spring of Year 5 Activities: Spring 2011

- ► SBOE held required public hearings at each of the 7 schools
- During hearings:
 - School performance data provided
 - State law requirements explained
 - District presented proposal for each school
 - Community members provided testimony
- ▶ RFP for third-party operators issued, eligible vendors identified

Topics

State and Federal Context

- ► Activities Preceding SBOE Interventions
- ► Indiana's Turnaround Academies

SBOE Interventions: Fall 2011

- Schools placed in performance categories by SBOE
- ► SBOE determined which interventions to implement at 7 schools under P.L. 221 requirements
- Five Schools assigned Turnaround School Operators (TSOs)
 - Edison Learning: Theodore Roosevelt Community High School (Gary)
 - ► Tindley/EdPower: Arlington High School (IPS)
 - ► Charter Schools USA: Emma Donnan, Emmerich Manual High School, Thomas Carr Howe Community High School (IPS)
 - ► There was one "observation" year in 2011-2012. The first year each TSO managed the school was the 2012-2013 school year.
- Two IPS Schools assigned Lead Partners (LPs)
 - ► Broad Ripple Magnet High School (two Lead Partners: Scholastic, The New Teacher Project ("TNTP")
 - ► George Washington Community High School (two Lead Partners: Wireless Generation, TNTP

SBOE Interventions: Fall 2012 and Winter 2013

- ► In Fall 2012, one additional IPS school became eligible for SBOE intervention under P.L. 221
- ► The SBOE assigned a **Lead Partner** as the appropriate intervention
 - ► John Marshall Community High School (two Lead Partners: Voyager, TNTP)
- ► In Winter 2013, a school from Evansville Vanderburgh School Corporation became eligible for SBOE intervention under P.L. 221
- ► The SBOE assigned a **Lead Partner** as the appropriate intervention
 - ► Glenwood Leadership Academy ("internal" Lead Partner: EVSC, which in turn contracts with Mass Insight)

SBOE Interventions: Potential for Fall 2014

- ► Gary (2) and Evansville (2)
- ► Public hearings held July and August 2014
- Once A-F grades assigned, SBOE will be required to take action if these schools are placed in the lowest performance category
- Possible concentration in three districts: EVSC, GCSC and IPS